

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Applicant(s):	Maharaj Mukherjee	Examiner:	Michael C. Maskulinski
Serial No.:	10/604,585	Group Art Unit:	2113
Filed:	July 31, 2003	Attorney Docket No:	FIS920030265US1
Title:	DYNAMICALLY CONFIGURABLE FAULT TOLERANCE IN AUTONOMIC COMPUTING WITH MULTIPLE SERVICE POINTS		

---

**AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE**

Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment  
Assistant Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This paper is submitted in response to a non-final Office Action mailed April 7, 2006 by the United States Patent and Trademark Office in connection with the above-identified Application. A response to this April 7, 2006 Office Action is due by July 7, 2006. Therefore, this paper is being timely filed.

**Amendments to the Claims** begin on page 2 of this paper.

**Remarks** begin on page 4 of this paper.

### Amendments to the Claims

The following list of claims replaces all previous versions of claims. Applicant has amended claims marked as currently amended, and cancelled claims marked as cancelled, voluntarily without prejudice.

11. (Currently Amended) A method for configuring a system having a plurality of processors to provide the system with at least one cluster of processors, each cluster having one service point, the method comprising the steps of:

computing a distance from each processor to other processors in the system;

computing a plurality of total distances, where each total distance is associated with one processor;

determining a minimum total distance from the plurality of total distances; and

assigning as the service point the processor having the minimum total distance associated therewith;

partitioning the system into a plurality of clusters, the partitioning comprising:

sorting the processors in accordance with the total distance associated with each processor;

assigning each processor to one of two clusters;

determining a minimum total distance for the processors in each cluster in accordance with the plurality of total distances associated with the processors in said cluster; and

assigning as the service point for each cluster the processor having the minimum total distance associated therewith in said cluster,

subdividing one of said two clusters into two subdivided clusters, thereby partitioning the system into three clusters;

determining a minimum total distance for the processors in each of said three clusters in accordance with the plurality of total distances associated with the processors in said three clusters;

assigning the processors to said three clusters in accordance with the minimum total distance; and

assigning as the service point for each of said three clusters the processor having the minimum total distance associated therewith in said cluster.

12-15. (Cancelled)

16. (Original) A method according to claim 11, wherein said configuring is performed dynamically when a processor is added to the system.

17. (Original) A method according to claim 11, wherein said configuring is performed dynamically when a processor is removed from the system.

18. (Original) A method according to claim 17, wherein the partitioning of the system is dynamically changed when a processor is removed from the system.

19. (Original) A method according to claim 11, further comprising the step of assigning another processor as a backup service point.

20. (Cancelled)

### **REMARKS**

The present Amendment and Response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of objections and/or rejections raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Applicant asserts that the present invention is new, non-obvious and useful. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

### **Status of the Claims**

Claims 11, 16-19 are pending in the present application. Claims 12-15 and 20 have been cancelled without prejudice.

Claim 11 has been voluntarily amended.

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for allowing claim 14 on condition that it be rewritten in independent form to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 14 depends from claim 13 that in turn depends from claim 12 that in turn depends from independent claim 11. Applicants have amended claim 11 to include all the limitations of claims 12, 13, and 14. In view of this amendment, independent claim 11 is now deemed patentable.

### **Remarks to Claim Rejections**

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102***

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 11-13, 15-18, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), as being anticipated by Liron (US Patent No. 5,598,532).

Without conceding any correctness of the Examiner's rejections of above claims

under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), Applicants have voluntarily, without prejudice, amended claim 11 to include all the limitations of claims 12, 13, and 14. Applicant asserts that the amendments add no new matter.

Claim 14, which is now amended claim 11, has been allowed by the Examiner.

Claims 16-18 depend directly or indirectly from amended claim 11 and include all the distinct elements of claim 11 as well as additional distinctive features and elements. Thus, claims 16-18 are patentable for at least the reasons as described above with regard to claim 11.

Applicant has cancelled claims 12-15 and 20 without prejudice.

In view of above, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner's rejections of claims 11 and 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) be withdrawn.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103***

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Liron.

Claim 19 depends directly from amended claim 11 and includes all the distinctive elements of claim 11 as well as additional distinct features and elements. Thus, claim 19 is patentable at least for the reasons as described above with regard to claim 11.

In view of above, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner's rejections of claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

#### **Conclusion**

In view of the preceding remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

No fees are believed to be due in connection with this paper. However, if there is any such fee due, please charge any such fee to the deposit account No. 09-0458.

Respectfully submitted,



Yuanmin Cai  
Agent for Applicants  
Registration No. 56513

Dated: June 19, 2006

**INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINE CORPORATION**

Intellectual Property Law Department, East Fishkill

2070 Route 52, Bldg-321, Zip-482

Hopewell Junction, NY 12533

Tel: (845) 894-8469

Fax: (845) 892-6363